

chairman indicate that the last motion to recommit was designed to delay. If it was merely designed to delay, then why in the world was the bill pulled from the floor and sat on for 4 weeks? The answer: it was not for delay. We had some serious considerations and questions and points to be made about the risk that this was raising.

When I hear my friend from Texas talk about those who love liberty, listen, some of us love liberty enough that we believe the Constitution should not be extended on the battlefield to those who are trying to destroy what our forefathers and foremothers have fought and died to give us.

Now, unless the Democrats believe that they have improved this bill, then there was no reason for a month delay. So either you improved it, Mr. Speaker, either the Democrats improved it or there was no reason to sit on it for a month. And if they did improve it, then the motion to recommit was not political, but apparently helpful.

The problem is this doesn't fix the problems. And unless one party in this body has 100 percent on God's truth all the time, they ought to allow some input from the other side. We were told that was going to happen. It hasn't happened here. We went to the Rules Committee the last time and were shut out. Before the hearing started we were told, put on your evidence but no amendments will be allowed. This time, once again, no amendments are allowed. There is some expertise in this body outside the Democratic Party. I would think it would be helpful to hear some of that.

Anyway, let's look at the bill itself. We are told, well, we can't get into it, we have limited time. Who did that? The Rules Committee did that. The Rules Committee did that.

I would say to everyone, Mr. Speaker, that we have some smart people on both sides of the aisle on the Rules Committee, but their talents are being wasted when they keep having Rules Committee meetings that come back over and over, no amendments. They are wasting their time. They ought to ask for different committees because there is too much intelligence and talent on that committee to waste it like that.

Now, in this new bill that we've got, we had to make amendments without even seeing the new bill. How outrageous is that? But still, we have the requirement that the Director of National Intelligence, and I realize some people think he is suspect on the Democratic side because he worked for the Clinton administration for 6 years. I think he is a brilliant, sharp fellow.

But anyway, he testified before our Judiciary Committee that he cannot swear, nobody can honestly swear that they reasonably believe that a terrorist on foreign soil will never call the United States. Therefore, since he can't testify to that, they can't use this provision.

We are told this is protective because in the emergency provision that is al-

lowed, all you have to do is get that emergency relief, and you can get that in 7 days instead of 15. Even under the emergency relief, you have to reasonably believe there will never be a call into the United States, and we had testimony that can never be done.

This guts our foreign intelligence capability. I think the easier thing to do is just have everybody tell their U.S. friends that if you are getting calls from foreign terrorists, tell them not to call, use some other means of communication. That's the point.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to inform each side as to the amount of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 15½ minutes and the gentleman from Washington has 9½ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Mr. REYES.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an incredible turn of events from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are now arguing for undocumented people within the confines of this country.

Let me start out by making a flat statement. The RESTORE Act confers no additional rights on undocumented aliens beyond those that they already have under the Constitution or current U.S. law.

You know, there is an old lawyer's adage, and I am not a lawyer but I am told by my friends who are, when the facts are not on your side, you are taught to argue the law. When the law is not on your side, you are taught to argue the facts.

Well, here on the floor like we have in the past, we have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that are so conflicted as to be humorous if this wasn't such a serious, serious issue for our country and for our national security.

When they complain about not having any input, let me just clear the record and for the record state that they filed 12 amendments with our committee, the Intelligence Committee. Yet, when it came time to offer and proffer those amendments, they only had two. One was on immunity which, by the way, we have never been given the documents to review, so we would not have known what we were granting immunity to the telecom companies for. But that one was of their amendments. The second amendment was to substitute the Protect America Act for the RESTORE Act.

That gives you a clear indication that, today just as in the previous Congresses, the Congressional Republicans were and are in a rush to rubber-stamp every single thing that the administration wanted. And so now when things have changed and we have checks and balances, we have our colleagues who

formerly rushed, rubber-stamped anything and everything that the administration wanted to do, now they are using delaying tactics. And so when it is convenient, they argue the law. When it is convenient, they argue the facts.

What is clear, crystal clear, here is that we have to have checks and balances. In order to protect this country, in order to protect our national security, there have to be checks and balances. That's what the RESTORE Act does.

And when they complain about the rule, it is a sham argument. When they complain about not having enough input, it is a sham argument. When they argue the facts, it is because the law is not on their side. When they argue the law, it is because the facts are not on their side. So it is not about truth; it is not even about justice. It is about scoring political victories.

There is a publication here on the Hill that said FISA is coming back up on the floor and it will determine who can maneuver best. You know what, as an American, I am sick and tired of maneuvering. I am sick and tired of people saying we need to work in a bipartisan manner when they work to undermine the process of checks and balances. The American people are sick and tired.

I support this rule. I think we have a great bill here in the RESTORE Act. I think this is something that we need to pass today, take it to conference and start being serious about balancing the tools that our agencies need to protect us with a careful balance of protecting Americans' rights under the Constitution. Vote for this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition as ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Terrorism Subcommittee. And I can share this: there has not been a terrorist attack on our soil since 9/11, and that is due in part to the improved surveillance in real-time that we are able to conduct against foreign terrorists. There is no disputing that.

I cannot help but feel that many of my colleagues have become so blinded by their hatred of this administration that they have put the threat from radical jihadists in the back of their mind. But given the threat, it is unfathomable that we would weaken our most effective preventive tool, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Before we unilaterally disarm, before we hobble our ability to listen in real-time to the very real terrorists who are plotting against our country around this globe, shouldn't we have something of an accounting of the supposed civil liberties price we are paying?

I asked the Congressional Research Service for such an accounting. They reported there is no available evidence of the type of privacy violations critics